



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,438	11/01/2001	Faisal M. Awada	AU920010885US1	3560

7590 09/01/2005  
Mr. Volel Emile  
P.O. Box 202170  
Austin, TX 78720-2170

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**MAILED**

SEP 01 2005

Technology Center 2100



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/002,438  
Filing Date: November 01, 2001  
Appellant(s): AWADA ET AL.

---

Volel Emile  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 21 July 2005.

RD

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

The brief does not contain a statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief. Therefore, it is presumed that there are none. The Board, however, may exercise its discretion to require an explicit statement as to the existence of any related appeals and interferences.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) *Claims Appealed***

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) *Prior Art of Record***

Brisebois (U.S. Patent 6,219,679 B1), filed 18 March 1998, issued 17 April 2001.

Littlefield (U.S. Patent 6,564,208 B1), filed 24 February 2000, issued 13 May  
2003.

**(9) *Grounds of Rejection***

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all  
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2176

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 6-7, 12-13, 18-19, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brisebois (U.S. Patent 6,219,679 B1) in view of Littlefield (U.S. Patent 6,564,208 B1).

As per claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, Brisebois discloses a method, apparatus, computer program product and computer system containing a processor and memory for bookmarking a section of a Web page including storing a network address (or URL) of the page (See Brisebois, Figure 3A, and Column 4, lines 62-63), storing the section of the page such that when the network address is used to access and display the page, the section of the page is displayed (See Brisebois, Column 1, lines 54-67), the section storing step including storing a current size of a window within which the page is displayed (See Brisebois, Figure 3C, and Column 5, lines 33-36), and storing positions of scroll boxes in scroll bars in the window (See Brisebois, Figure 3D, and Column 5, lines 49-53). Brisebois does not disclose expressly storing font attributes of the displayed page. Littlefield discloses storing font attribute information within a search result web page. (See Littlefield, Column 5, lines 49-59). Brisebois and Littlefield are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of storing Web page information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the storing of font attribute information of Littlefield with the storing of the section of the Web page of Brisebois. The motivation for doing so would have been to display the text items of the Web page that contain non-default font

attributes using the non-default font attributes specified in the Web page. (See Littlefield, Column 5, lines 54-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Littlefield with Brisebois for the benefit of displaying text using the font attributes specified in the Web page to obtain the invention as defined in claims 1, 7, 13, and 19.

As per claims 6, 12, 18, and 24, Brisebois and Littlefield disclose the limitations of claims 5, 11, 17, and 23 as described above. Brisebois also discloses storing X-Y coordinates of the window and the scroll boxes. (See Brisebois, Figure 3A, Column 4, lines 62-67, Column 5, lines 1-2, and Column 6, lines 45-53).

#### **(10) *Response to Argument***


With regard to Appellant's argument on Pages 5-6 of the Appeal Brief that the prior art of record fails to disclose or teach storing font attributes when bookmarking a page, the Office respectfully disagrees. Littlefield teaches storing font attribute information in a search result Web page (See Littlefield, Column 5, lines 54-59). Further, it is well known in the art that Web pages, in the form of program code providing instruction to a computer processor, are stored in some form of memory. Littlefield further teaches that instructions sent to a processor are stored in non-volatile media or volatile media, such as optical or magnetic disks, or dynamic memory, such as main memory (See Littlefield, Column 7, lines 23-30). Storing search result Web pages allows a user accessing the search results through a browser to navigate forward and backward among Web pages listing search results. The font attribute information is

stored in the Web page, as taught by Littlefield, and the Web page is stored, consequently, the font attribute information stored within the Web page is stored along with the Web page.


With regard to Appellant's argument on Pages 6-8 of the Appeal Brief questioning the motivation for combining the bookmarking of Brisebois and the search results of Littlefield, the Office respectfully notes that search results are often bookmarked by users who may desire to return to a listing of search results at a later time without having to recreate or re-enter the conditions of the search. The motivation for storing the font attribute information stored in the search result Web pages of Littlefield with the bookmarking system and method of Brisebois would be for the benefit of retrieving sections of search results while preserving the original theme of a Web site. For instance, a search result for "Halloween" would return a result title in a "gothic" font to stand out from other search results.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Laurie Ries  
August 30, 2005

Conferees

  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
8/30/2005

  
Heather Hendon

  
**STEPHEN HONG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**



Application/Control Number: 10/002,438  
Art Unit: 2176

Page 9

Mr. Volel Emile  
P.O. Box 202170  
Austin, TX 78720-2170